JK
1903
.T4

Votes for Women

EDMUND R. TERRY
FORMER MEMBER NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE

PRICE, 50 CENTS

Class JX1903

Book .J4

Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

VOTES FOR WOMEN

WHY ?

— *By* —

EDMUND R. TERRY

FORMER MEMBER NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE

NEW YORK

NINETEEN SEVENTEEN

JK 1903
.T4

Copyrighted, 1917
By
Edmund R. Terry

SEP 10 1917

©CLA476232
no 1

CHAP. I

In answer to a correspondent, a woman, but a citizen and constituent just the same, an Assemblyman wrote stating his position upon the "Cause": "It may be that the Almighty made a mistake in the creation of the sexes. If that be so, it is of course the duty of the Legislature to rectify the blunder so far as possible."

By implication that suggests the sentiment that urges too large a number of the suffragists in their demands for the ballot; it is not so much a desire for the vote "per se", but to have it as a protest against the fact that they are women and with a vague idea that its exercise may in some way eliminate certain of the differentiations between human beings due to sex, and the operation of natural laws.

One of the earliest advocates of "Woman's Rights" was Mrs. Doctor Mary Walker. She has always insisted that the distinctions between male and female should be eliminated. She was at any rate consistent, so far as she could be. She exhibited the courage of her convictions. She assumed those habiliments conventionally typical of masculinity. She wore pants—real pants—leather boots with legs, Prince Albert coat, masculine linen underwear—so far as was

apparent—silk hat and a big umbrella with her hair cut in manly fashion. Other advocates of the cause have not yet exhibited the same sincere consistency. At least I have not heard of their discarding all feminine fashions and fripperies to advance upon the Legislature of any State, clad in the garb of mere man. Yet if there be anything in the equality they claim so strenuously, why should it not hold in respect of so superficial a matter as that of raiment?

Dissatisfaction with one's lot, wherever or however its lines may be cast, is common to all humanity. So it is not to be wondered at that at times many women should be dissatisfied with their's. Even in the days of Adam—after the Fall—there were doubtless times when Eve would infinitely have preferred Adam's functions to her own, though in those primitive times there were no rostrums for her to mount and no other dissatisfied females about to foment her unhappiness and discontent.

Sundry of the marbles brought to the British Museum by Lord Elgin from Greece, teach an object lesson that is just as pregnant with meaning for us moderns as it was for those ancient and worthy Greeks whose eyes first beheld the beautiful and instructive product of the master sculptor's conception. Whoever he was, his art was as art always should be, the wondrous exponent

of Philosophic Truth. The frequent occurrence of the Amazons in those wonderful "bas-reliefs" declare indubitably that the symptoms of Feminism were not unknown to the artist. The thoughful observer will notice that the Amazons are all in the prime of life, beautiful in form and feature and well fitted to adorn any position in life except that which they are represented as filling. True, that where depicted astride of their spirited chargers, brandishing their spears with all the vigor of their physical perfection, they do seem irresistible enough. The reverse of the picture shows only too clearly the strength of their womanly weakness; strong and brave though they be, theirs is sufficient of womanly nature to work their undoing. Not even the stern necessity of war has availed to part them from the beauty of their luxuriant tresses. Of this fact the rude heroes to whom they are opposed have taken a most impolite and unseemly advantage; with their brutal hands intertwined in and ferociously clutching their beauteous locks, they have pulled the battling maidens from their horses and are represented as dragging them about over the ground, clubbing and despitefully maltreating them.

Thus whenever woman deserting her higher sphere and abandoning all the advantages over man that the Creator has given her, tries to cope

with him in the lower arena of physical and material contest, it must usually result in her discomfiture and humiliation.

The movement toward "Votes for Women" is very largely a manifestation of the same distorted sentiment, the desire to be like men. That it is the feeling that animates consciously or unconsciously the greater number of those women who demand the vote is evident to every one who is in a position to watch their demonstrations with intelligent scrutiny. It is true that there are some minor influences that contribute to the support of the cause which will be considered later; at present we will take the bull by the horns.—I use this expression by way of concession to the feminists,—and consider first this fundamental aspect of the question. There are many little things that tend to show the drift, the desire to get away from anything that makes a distinction between the sexes. There are no more doctresses, now they are all doctors. Even spinsters are vanishing and bachelors are taking their places. How many bright girls would toil through a college course for a degree of "Spinster of Arts" or spend further years to be dubbed "Mistress of Arts"? In a sense it is true that there is no sex in intellectual attainments. In another sense it is one of the most pernicious falsehoods ever uttered.

Where women devote themselves to study from a fondness for learning, it is a noble pursuit. Where it is merely to put themselves in the same category as men, it is a mistake.

A woman may become masculine, but never manly.

A female Senator from a suffrage state put the situation very aptly. She disclaimed the honorable title of "Mrs." though she was also a Mother, and insisted upon being addressed by the merely political title of Senator.

As a member of the Legislature of my state, I have seen the women as they have come, year after year, to "battle" for the cause at the state Capital, and my own observation, reinforced by that of others, has been that year by year they have been losing that subtle distinction from men that has always given women a sovereignty of their own more impregnable than they can ever gain from the political recognition which the suffragists demand. Nevertheless they are consistent, for the only way in which the equality they claim can be brought about is by reducing women to the level of men, and in that they are succeeding. One of them whom I remember, at her first appearance as a modest, attractive, womanly woman, had become decidedly masculine the last time I met her. She said to me moreover, " We are tired of hearing of 'woman's sphere'.

We do not want to be on a pedestal, we want to get 'down' from it and be just like men!"

The very proposition the suffrage women brought to the Legislature was that the Constitution of the State should be altered by the excision from it of the word "male," and a further absurd change purporting to put upon women the same military duties.

It is also very significant that the slogan of the "cause" is no longer "Female Suffrage." There is some subtle significance in that word "female," by reason of which its use seems to produce an effect upon a suffragist similar to that produced by waving a red flag before an excitable bull. At all events, it is now "Votes for Women." Now what do these things betray on the part of those responsible for them if not a contempt for the functions for which women are so especially endowed and an undue exaltation of those functions and attributes usually accorded to and exercised by men?

Some of the most unpleasant passages in history are those where rampant "Feminism" has been a considerable factor, as in the French Revolution and in the time of the decadence of the Roman Empire.

In the light in which the foregoing would seem to put it, this foolish demand for "Votes for Women" is not so much a logical demand for the

rectification of an unjust condition, but rather a sort of unthinking, hysterical protest against the fact that the God of Nations has made them women.

CHAP. II

There is every reason why women should glory in their own sex and more particularly in those "old fashioned" functions, peculiarly its own and that so effectually differentiate them from men. It is conceded at once that there are few, if any pursuits or callings in which women may not hold their own with men or even excel them. We had in our family a cook once—her day with us was providentially brief—who would have been more than a match for Jesse Willard in the roped arena. Nevertheless the pre-eminence of the sex comes not from any ability in the prize-ring, nor in any other of man's pursuits, but from those delicate, elusive, priceless, feminine qualities, all the more effective if supported by ample physical strength and enhanced by mental cultivation, that should ennoble all women and that motherhood brings to full development and beauty; qualities that too much contact and attrition with the busy world can only blunt and atrophy.

The question is, not can women do men's work, but rather shall they do it to the prejudice of those greater functions that they alone can exercise. Should a woman, gifted with a wonderful soprano voice, waste her life trying to sing bass!

As a rule, physical differences among men are

accompanied by corresponding mental differences. No man differs from any other man physically so fundamentally, as does any fully developed woman from any perfect man. There is a corresponding mental difference perhaps at times rather intangible, but nevertheless real. The great poets and dramatists of ancient times and all the great poets, dramatists and novelists since, both men and women, testify to this and after the present flurry is over, will continue to do so. This difference implies no superiority of one sex over the other. There are also many immaterial functions that both share; yet to each, particularly to woman, there are higher and nobler functions in which the other has no part. Gold is different from iron; each is valuable in distinctive ways, but it is an economic waste when one is used for any purpose to which the other is best adapted. From the results it would seem doubtful if many of the womens' colleges carried their teaching of Political Economy far enough to inculcate this truth.

Even before birth it would seem as if the Creator had bestowed more care on the girl than on the boy. She is born more intricately made physically and finer mentally. What has gone to fineness in her has gone to strength in him. As they grow to maturity, these physical and mental differences are normally accentuated.

He becomes more and more masterful and her femininity grows apace. Finally when man and woman meet in fulfillment of their eternal destiny, it is the man who conquers, the woman who surrenders. The fundamental difference between them is conclusively shown also by the natural results. These to the woman are permanent physical and mental changes and immediately anxiety and trouble, temporary physical and mental disability and finally agony and peril. But the man is immune from any physical consequences. There is no marked change in him, even mentally. This may be unjust to women and unfairly upset that equality that ought to exist between all human beings, and it certainly seems as if there should have been some way provided for the perpetuation of the race that did not involve so cruel a disparity. Nor can the various methods of birth control abate the difference. At best they result in the physical deterioration of the women who employ them.

Nevertheless, unpleasant as the fact may be, the sexes, each with its peculiar characteristics and limitations, are under existing natural laws, essential. This is a primal fact and must be borne in mind in the consideration of any question pertaining to the mutual relations of men and women

Immune though he may be from physical consequences, there is a subtle something in the nature of the normal male that compels him to stand by his mate, to comfort and soothe her in her moments of distress and anguish, and to protect and provide for her during her suffering and disability. Later to guard and provide for her and for their mutual prosperity during their period of helplessness and need. This is also the primal law of being even among the animals. While the female brute is bearing, nourishing, rearing, and training her brood, the male, ever alert, is guarding and providing for all until the young ones have reached a sufficient maturity to take care of themselves. With them that period is soon reached, the family—if we can so call it—disintegrates and the mutual responsibility of the parents ceases.

Mankind, however, is higher than the beasts that perish. The more intimate physical relations between the human mother and her young that establishes the life-long bond between them, ends with weaning, while her mental and spiritual motherhood, beginning with conception itself, brings into play all the tenderest and most beautiful of these womanly attributes, that nature and training have given her, is not even terminated by the grave, but its inspiring and ennobling influence endures through the lives of her children

and beyond. Is there any direction in which the finest minds, the broadest educations, the noblest characters of womankind can be more wisely devoted or more worthily and profitably spent?

During the entire period of such motherhood her functions are domestic or as that word literally means, concerned with the home; the father's, with the world outside, to wrest from it the means to enable her to perform her duties and to protect her from all unnecessary contact with it or attrition by it. The better he performs his duties the better can she fulfill her supreme functions of mother, wife, and home-maker. From all this comes naturally the institution of marriage, recognized and protected by Government and sanctified by religion, to the end that human motherhood may be cherished and protected and human fatherhood held and constrained to its duty.

Every good and intelligent woman recognizes in marriage the one great refuge and defence of her sex against men and any attack upon its integrity, whether by individual infidelity or by a larger and more insidious aggression; she rather than man instinctively resents and eagerly resists. The suffrage movement is such an aggression, and it is not to be wondered at that most women hailed the defeats of the suffragists in the elections of 1915 as a victory for real women. In New York State it certainly was. There the offer had been fre-

quently made by the Legislature to the suffragists that a special election would be arranged, surrounded by all known safeguards, at which all the women citizens of the State could vote and if a majority of them voted for it the necessary steps would have been taken to constitutionally give it to them. These offers were abruptly declined for the reason as given by the suffragists, "That they stood no chance of carrying such an election." In other words, they acknowledged that the big majority of modest, intelligent, womanly women were unalterably opposed to the "Cause." So it is a mistake to consider it as the "Cause" of women; it is merely the "Cause" of the suffragettes and is opposed to those things dear to the heart of real womankind.

CHAP. III

The underlying theory or rather the postulate upon which the demand for "Votes for Women" is based, is the "Equality of the Sexes." The very use of the word "equality" in such a connection is an error, as used by the suffragettes it implies a general similarity of functions that does not, never has and never can exist.

Marriage was established for the safeguarding of matrimony—note that word—and is vitally necessary for the protection of women and as contributing to that, the restraining and constraining of men. Were there no such thing as marriage, men would possess women just the same, but women would have little, if any hold upon men. This consideration manifestly does away with the theory of the "Equality of the Sexes" upon which the clamor for the ballot is founded, for it recognizes the need of women for protection. The Institution of Marriage is thus inconsistent with the demand of "Votes for Women," for it is a negation of the "Equality" on which the demand is based.

Many good and true women temporarily obsessed with the suffrage craze, are blinded to this aspect of the cause or are still too shrinkingly modest to wish to even consider it.

But there are others, restrained by no such

feminine timidity who make no bones about their opposition to marriage. That is the sentiment that is behind their approval of such monstrosities of plays as "When Hindle Wakes." It also finds expression in the assertion that the individual and not the family is now the social unit, and the revoltingly insulting characterization of our mothers, wives, sisters and friends who are nobly doing their full duty of home-making as parasitic women, as "Hareem women," and as lacking in intelligence.

Now suppose these ideals, these dreams of the suffragettes were to be realized; and in all pursuits political and otherwise—great and small men and women were working side by side on an equality, with marriage logically eliminated, "What would we have?"

Mr. Wells, in his novel, "When the Sleeper Wakes," has given a picture of such a social state, where in their various callings, there is, no distinction of sex, all are working together side by side with women doing men's work. When a woman incidentally is about to become a mother she goes to a state institution, is delivered of her progeny and so soon as her health can be restored, she resumes her place, whether high or low, in the ranks of the workers, while her offspring is taken care of scientifically by the state—probably under the direction of elderly spinsters who have

specialized in the rearing and education of the young. In other words "Lambing Stations" such as are reported to be covertly maintained in the suffragette state of Utah. Rosalie Sadova, a leading suffragette, is already quoted as in favor of just such state establishments.

Such is indeed a charming prospect; is it not? Yet the reality would probably be worse.

Were this merely an academic question, its discussion would preferably be avoided, but the suffragettes themselves have thrust the subject upon us.

June 9th, 1915 at a time when they fully expected a wide victory in New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and other states, the suffragists showed their hand. They held a great banquet at the Hotel LaSalle at which Doctor Anna Howard Shaw, president of the National Suffrage Association presided. Prof. W. I. Thomas of Chicago University was invited to address the assemblage. A large part of his speech was devoted to the right of women to become mothers outside of marriage.

He is quoted as saying, "The child by act of birth is made legitimate." The convention took no action criticising his views. Anna Shaw's comment was, as reported, "Political emancipation is not the only emancipation. Women must gain a greater freedom of "social" relations."

There were others who spoke approvingly, but to the credit of womanhood some there were who had the courage to protest.

This sentiment of Thomas' does not stand alone. It is merely selected as one of the frankest, most pointed and public expression of their opinion among the many that have come from leading suffragettes. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that Thomas spoke with the frankness that came with exultation over the sweeping victory that the suffragists then expected. Under such circumstances it was but natural for him to betray the real sentiments of those who listened to him with applause or approving silence. Now what social conditions would the adoption of these views lead to! Marriage would then be sustained only by Religion; but that too, according to the advanced Suffragettes is also obsolete and to be eliminated. Ethics might still survive and its teaching might have as much effect upon the people as the teaching of that great Ethic, Seneca, had upon his prize pupil Nero.

Now let it be noted that by the suffragists the father is ignored as a factor in the bringing up and training of the young; this is quite logical, for, under the assumed conditions, who would know whether he was a father or not?

It being no longer a disgrace for a woman to have a child born out of wedlock, and mothers,

in whatever way, being on a social and political equality, chastity would come to be considered a disgraceful folly; even the offense of rape would logically cease to be a felony and be of no more moment than any other assault and battery. Women could have absolutely no protection as a sex; there would then be no reason for it. To seek it would be an admission of inequality.

Suffragists either dare not or do not care to consider the effect that the adoption of their theories would have on men. With the social structure as it is to-day, wedded fatherhood raises a normal man to his highest possible estate.

With the responsibilities, the duties, the pleasures of fatherhood, practically denied to him as it would be in a shared or doubtful paternity, he would miss the highest incentive and stimulus that now can actuate him. There are duties and responsibilities that he can not escape under the Law that now rest even upon the illegitimate father. Marriage to a certain extent thus protects mothers who are without its pale. It cannot afford to allow men to ignore it without penalty. With all protection to women wiped out and all restraint as well as stimulus and incentive for men done away with, what social organization would be possible?

It is too gruesome and unpleasant a subject to pursue further, but when the suffragettes virtually

make free love a part of their propaganda, as they undeniably do, it is our duty to look the matter squarely in the face and see where it leads to. If we find its ultimate aim to be bad, its partial success can only be dangerous and demoralizing, and it becomes the part of every honest, decent man who respects womankind to oppose the movement—particularly when it becomes apparent that "Votes for Women", if gained, will be but a stepping stone to something worse.

The one State in which woman suffrage would seem to have been perfectly satisfactory to a majority of its citizens is the Mormon State of Utah. There they no longer have polygamy openly, but only plural, spiritual marriages that would seem to answer the purpose just as well. In the light of what they have already said, many of the leaders of the cause might with entire consistency urge the forcing of that system upon all the States by a National Constitutional Amendment. It would probably meet certain hygienic defects that they criticize in the present monogamous scheme of matrimony.

CHAP. IV

When I hear suffragettes, male or female, ranting upon the public rostrum about the independence of women from men, I cannot but wonder if they are quite right mentally. Were any one to demand the independence of men from women I would entertain the same sentiment. Broadly speaking, there is not, and in the nature of things cannot be, any such independence. On the contrary, from their very functions and characteristics there is of necessity a mutual inter-dependence between the sexes. Aside from the sensual, women depend upon men for certain things; men depend upon women for certain other things. The wants of each from the other are so entirely different that they cannot be compared as to relative values and these values cannot be expressed in economic terms. Were this not the rule of living followed by the two sexes—the neuters are very noisy, but should not count—the conditions of living would be nearly impossible. Writers like Charlotte Perkins, Stetson Gilman, either are blind to, or calmly ignore, all these things in life that cannot be reduced to an economic value expressed in terms of dollars and cents.

In this economic sense, mother-love and the reciprocal affection that it awakens is valueless,

and it is presumably for that reason that so many suffrage writers consider it as negligible or, merely silly.

CHAP. V

From the remote beginnings of recorded time, winding its beatific way down through the ages, the ennobling influence of womanly women has ever been working after its own gently effective methods for the real upward progress of the race. Ever urging their men to the attainment of better things. Ever inspiring, fostering and sustaining their better faiths, their nobler ambitions. Ever sympathetic in victory or in defeat, constant always in weal or in woe, such women have been the inspiration, the moral support, the spiritual mainstay of their men and of the race. The results of this influence, so gently exerted, has been cumulative, through the eras and to it we owe most of those essential blessings that still make life better worth the living.

It is true, there have been also other women, many of them, scattered through the centuries, whose dissatisfaction with their position and general discontent led them to accomplish much of harm, little of good, and whose main achievement was what such women crave, notoriety. It is of such that Horace wrote: "Mulier teterissima causa multi belli."

Unwillingly, though it was, some of them may have been of advantage to the world. Had it not been for the railings of Xanthippe her hus-

band, Socrates, might never have reached the philosophic heights that he did. Yet even she was no feminist in the accepted sense.

But to return to our pleasanter subject. Those good women of whose lives and works we are the grateful heirs and beneficiaries performed their good deeds unostentatiously, they sought no publicity, no recognition, but were content with the happiness that comes from a consciousness of duty well done. Who can measure the effect upon human life of the thousands and thousands of good, long enduring, intelligent, industrious, loving, unselfish wives and mothers and those other less fortunate but blessed women who steadfastly through all known time have persistently interwoven into the fabric of human existence those brighter and happier shades that relieve its general gloom.

Happily for us, however, some have not escaped the notice of poet and historian.

What was the lode-star, the hope, the yearning that brought the wily Ulysses safely through the perils of his voyage back from Troy? He knew that during the long years of his absence Penelope would not have retained all the charms of her young beauty, but he longed for the flower into which he felt such a bud must have developed. He wanted to bask in the sweet affection of her ripened womanliness, to be again in touch

with her subtle feminine intellectuality. To rest after all his toils in the house that she had kept and maintained for him, and to lean his declining years on the son that she had borne and reared for him. All these constituted Home, and it was for that he had been longing, and she was its centre, but till his return it was incomplete; to be perfect, the protector was needed.

The story of Egeria, whether it be fact or fable, illustrates the effectiveness of intellectual feminity working through a man in so momentous a matter as the founding of a great state. She was no public character, her confidences were for Romulus alone.

If all that we knew about Cornelia was the story that when other women of her rank were boasting of their ornaments she brought out her two boys with the simple comment, "These are my jewels," we would recognize her womanly greatness. It was, furthermore, a competent mother who spoke. We know of her that united in her beautiful person were the severe virtues of the early Roman matron and the superior knowledge, refinement, and culture which even then prevailed in the higher classes of Rome. She was well acquainted with the literature of Greece, and spoke and wrote her own language with elegant certainty.

Left a widow with twelve children she had de-

voted herself with all her talents to their education, rejecting all offers of a second marriage, and adhering to her resolution, even when tempted by Ptolemy, who offered to share with her his crown and the throne of Egypt. Hers was no public career, but her sons were of Rome's greatest orators and statesmen, and when her work was finished the Roman people, out of their gratitude and respect, erected a statue to her memory and upon it inscribed the title of which she in life had been justly proud: "Cornelia, Mother of the Gracchi."

Per contra one of the prominent suffragists, zealous in the cause of uplifting her sex, when asked how she could spend so much time at it and also attend to her children, flippantly replied: "Oh, those brats! I hire a competent nurse and turn them over to her." That is not as bad as it sounds, if the underlying theories of the suffragists be correct; she should be freed from the dwarfing and enslaving tendencies of family cares. Women like Cornelia were poor, ignorant, deluded victims of a system that it is hoped, by some, that votes for women will tend to eliminate.

Among the principal deities worshipped by the old Romans, none was more revered or so frequently sacrificed to as Vesta. She was essentially the conservator of sweetness, purity and light, the goddess of the home, the guardian and protector

of all those subtle, indescribable, lovely elements that are essential to a real home and that only women, real womanly women can supply. The appreciation of her value to the State as controlling and conserving those priceless feminine qualities was shown in the character of the public worship offered to her. As the home is essentially woman's creation—men can furnish the mere building and the purchasable accessories, but those do not make the home; only a woman's loving art employed on the materials can do that. So it was that no man had a part in Vesta's rites, only women could perform them; while the sacred and Eternal Fire that was her emblem—other divinities had graven images—was kept ever alive by the ministrations of the Vestal Virgins, and to be of that small but select body came to be esteemed one of the highest honors that could come to a high-born Roman maiden. To the Vestals were accorded honors, privileges and prerogatives enjoyed by no other Roman citizens, and it was the popular belief that with the extinction of the Sacred fire that burned on the altar of Vesta would come the fall of the State. And what state could or can survive the loss of the reverence for homes? Rome did not. The curse of feminism struck her women. With that came the inevitable loss to them of the respect of men. The fires upon the family altars flickered to extinction.

As women came more and more to contemn the prerogatives that were peculiarly theirs by nature, they lost more and more the faculty and the desire to make and keep up the homes. When women deserted the work for which they alone were fitted, there was no one who could take their places and homes deteriorated until they were mostly such only in name. The salt had lost its savor. The social structure lost that upon which its stability depended. The inevitable disintegration followed and the once mighty City became the easy prey of any foe that chose to attack it.

The early Romans were wise men when they gave such prominence to the worship of Vesta, the goddess of their homes, wise when they thought so much of their protection and maintenance, wise when they gave the government and control of their domestic kingdoms or principalities to their womenkind; but they probably erred by such restrictions in other matters as to lead their home-makers to regard as an enforced drudgery what should have been a labor of love. Yet all through the stormy times of the Fall of the Empire there were homes that still persisted; had there not been such, Rome would have been a worse Hell than it was.

CHAP. VI

Derided and contemned though they may be by the Suffragists, homes are and always have been as necessary to humanity as nests are to birds. Nests, however, are to-day just as they always have been while the home of to-day is the result of a process of evolution from the most primitive shelter. In that process women have had the dominant part. Let us consider the normal genesis of a home—a primitive home. Suppose a normal man and a normal woman are cast away upon an uninhabited island, so remote that rescue or escape from it are practically impossible; both are civilized and educated. At first their educated natures rebelling against their natural instincts will keep them apart—widely apart—each content with such temporary shelter as for the time being is most convenient, if either has a permanent place it will probably be the woman. In such a case nature would in time prove to be more powerful than any conventions of a distant society, and they would come together, a preliminary exchange of solemn vows would give to each that respect for the other so necessary for lasting happiness, and immediately a permanent shelter would be desirable as a common meeting place, if no more. In its erection he, being the stronger, would do most of the work. Its arrangement and

plan she would probably direct. That provided, at first they would roam about together in hunting for supplies, she on the constant lookout for such things as might improve or beautify their primitive abode, while his eyes were directed for supplies more material. Soon the time would come when she no more felt able to accompany him on his long and laborious quests, but would remain pottering about their place, while he, realizing and rejoicing in her condition—we are presuming them both to be normal—would redouble his efforts to provide her with the necessary food and would further exert himself to get such things as would please her, all the while trying to devise something to add to the comfort of their mutual abode. Would it be surprising if she, realizing how he was working, took it upon herself to see that he had something good to eat? As each worked for the other, so would their love and affection increase by leaps and bounds—and the elements of home grow till insensibly it becomes an accomplished fact.

Presently there is the child, and the happy domestic triangle is complete.

With its advent there comes of necessity a change in duties. With the necessary care and nurture of the babe, she has now no time for matters out of the house, while the proud and happy father with the added responsibility has

little or no time for anything material inside it, so the natural divergence of the parents grows into a fixed habit. And the child? Content at first with mere existence and perhaps mentally too bewildered at the strangeness of his surroundings to take notice of anything, he presently begins to observe, and the strange things about him begin to have identities. His first conscious recognition is of the mother at whose breast he is fed. When hungry he turns to her. As he grows beyond the need of the material sustenance that she gave him, he comes to the need of physical and mental guidance. Then for her is the teaching of language to the puzzled little lips. With infinite patience she guides and supports the tottering, uncertain little footsteps. Thus from the beginning of his conscious intelligence he recognizes her as his best friend, his closest and most sympathetic adviser, comforter and supporter.

It is not only the use of mind and body that he learns from her, but if she be a real mother, there comes the introduction of his open, grasping intelligence to the greater things of life, the spiritual. And the father he recognizes as a clumsy being who somehow has the right to take him in his arms, kiss him and caress him, and sometimes at night to pick him up and carry him about in his arms to quiet his infantile terrors or soothe his restlessness; he is to him a sort of an assistant

to his mother. Later he comes to recognize him as the final authority in the household. It is for the boy's mental and spiritual health that such should be the case. Such are the conditions that prevail in almost any normal young family. I have supposed the earlier conditions merely to show how naturally and, as a matter of course, when there is a child, the father and mother take their respective positions relative to each other, to the child and the home, they all have in common. It is natural that the husband's duty to the others should keep him outside, wrestling with the world to gain for them sustenance and support from it. It is natural that the normal affections of the mother should keep her busy with the internal affairs of the home and with the attention required by the precious infant in it, and there may come others, but that or they need not of necessity check or dwarf her mental progress.

The brainiest, best educated, most cultured and most efficient woman I ever knew was the mother of eight—and there are others like her.

The creation of homes is not as some suffragists, leading ones at that, claim, that wives and mothers shall be immured therein and mentally cribbed, cabined and confined, but that in its precious confines, with as little as possible from outside to interfere with or annoy or disturb, the choicest,

dearest, tenderest beauties of her womanhood may have full opportunity to bud, blossom and bear fruit.

A contemplation of any bunch of suffragettes will serve to emphasize my meaning.

Now permit me to give one or two choice examples of the profundity of official suffragist literature, after reading which I have written as I have of those ideals and institutions revered by most of us that it is the expressed purpose of the suffragists to overthrow:

"The Isolated Household is responsible for a large share of woman's ignorance and degradation. A mind always in contact with children and servants, whose aspirations and ambitions rise no higher than the roof that shelters it, is necessarily dwarfed in its proportions." . . . "Co-operative labor and co-operative homes will remove many difficulties in the way of woman's success as artisan and house-keeper when admitted to governing power."

Now, what do they mean by an "Isolated Household?" Why the ordinary homes, whether humble or grand, as distinguished from what they term "a co-operative home," which, by the way, could never have those fundamentals, characteristics of a real home, such a home as is dear to the heart of nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand. One would presume also that

the ambition to be a successful mother was no higher than the roof, and was not to be compared with the nobler ambition, to be a successful artisan or house-keeper!

In similar vein is the remark attributed to the learned Anna Howard Shaw, "I don't believe in mother's love, I believe in mother intelligence." If she ever really said that, she could not in so few words deserve the contemptuous pity of every man or woman who has been blessed in having an intelligent and loving mother and these are but samples of their expressions.

Easy divorce is another rotten and obtrusive plank in the suffragette platform. One necessity to a real home is the permanency of the marriage relation; but home, like mother's love, is one great object of ridicule to a writer whose works have been approved and recommended by the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

CHAP. VII

The great fallacy permeating much of the suffragist writings and speeches is that they proceed upon the theory that the object of sex is merely the gratification of the individuals; it is not. That is an incident.

The perpetuation of the race is its great purpose. "Society is chiefly concerned with the welfare of the children upon whom its future depends." The experience of mankind has demonstrated that monogamous marriages for life, together with the homes so dear to all of us, except the suffragettes, have so far produced the best results, and any movement attacking marriage and the home, unless it purposes something demonstrably better, is misconceived and dangerous. I have a profound pity and compassion for such good women, for there are some such among the suffragists—who have been misled by sophistries and plain lying, carried away by a certain sort of hysteria and an honest, though mistaken, belief that votes for women will benefit the sex and the country, but only contempt for those leaders who know full well whither they are leading their deluded followers.

For the careless thinking men who say, "Oh, if women want to vote why let them", I would suggest the story of the man in a boat full of

boys on a deep river who said, "Oh, if the boys want to rock the boat why let them". He did, they had their wish and all were drowned.

And what shall we say of these . . . (?) whether they wear trousers or skirts, who use their positions of educational authority to poison the impressionable young minds mistakenly committed to their training, by the inculcation of these subtle doctrines, and by teaching them to regard as old fashioned, contemptible, and valueless the most precious heritages of humanity!

CHAP. VIII

The vast majority of women are or will be wives and mothers and the vast majority of men husbands and fathers, and what is best for them and for the future of the race should be our chief concern rather than the limited future or welfare of the unfortunate minority of both sexes who have somehow missed or forfeited the real fulness of living. Even for those of them who are women, there are under existing conditions no limitations set to their activities, except as to elective political offices, by any laws except those of nature, and those cannot be repealed even by unanimous popular vote. Even were they given the ballot it would only serve to exclude them from many opportunities that are open to them as women. For instance, take Katherine Bement Davis, simply as an able public spirited woman she holds and has held distinguished public offices, irrespective of politics. As a mere voter she would be simply a partisan with her future circumscribed by the success or failure of the party she has espoused—if I may use that word in her case. She is but an example of many others.

On the other hand, there are many thousand wives during the progress of every campaign whose physical condition is such that common humanity and decency dictate that they should

be protected from all that might excite or annoy them. To those who know politics, particularly women politics, is there any doubt that in the event of a close contest at the polls all such protection would be swept away if such women had votes to cast? That reason by itself should deter men from voting for suffrage.

CHAP. IX

Now what are some of the characteristics of the women who demand the vote?

They are a noisy crowd; in fact it is doubtful if any other body of women could be found who could make so much noise in proportion to their numbers. The recklessness with which they treat the rights of others is appalling. Their obstreperousness is simply unholy. Their self-respect difficult to place. Their acquaintance with logic or real facts very cursory. Their regard for the truth practically burned out by the fervor of their imagination.

In fact their general character too generously displayed is such that we might begin to feel as M. Tullius Cicero, the orator did when he exclaimed, "How long, oh Cataline, will you abuse our patience?"

I admit there are some nice, charming, clever, respectable, quiet women in their ranks—perhaps many such. How they can be there I cannot explain, except that they are women, and as has been well said, "The ways of women are like those of Providence, inscrutable."

It may not be unprofitable to consider here somewhat of the personnel, the manner and kind of women who compose the suffrage cohorts.

Among the leaders are some with large expe-

rience and an over-abundance of money, who might have been better, happier and more contented had they had less of both; as it is they have gorged themselves to repletion with all the pleasures money can buy or the gratification of their senses produce. To escape from ennui they want the fierce excitement of contest and they seek it through the advocacy of the Cause. Some there are who having reduced their husbands and families to subjection are now anxious to extend their sway to other fields. Others are simple non-conformists; there is a similar class among men who are opposed to any existing order of things because they verily believe that whatever is—is wrong. Others again have successfully advocated matters that were meritorious and are now settled; but their zest for advocacy is unabated and unwilling to rest, they have cast in their lot with the suffragists. Others inflamed by stories of injustice in other states are fighting imaginary evils elsewhere.

Others are in their ranks because it brings them into close contact with women of note that otherwise—they would not meet. A very large number as we have seen, probably a majority of them, demand the ballot because they abominate being women and think that that will make them more like men. Most of them are more like men now, than they realize. Others, again, court the

specious distinction that mere notoriety confers, and it is amazing how many have attained a quasi prominence by their notorious and unblushing advocacy of suffrage and feminism, while some, a very few, have found in it the chance that had failed them elsewhere and got married.

Then there are those who think that it, in some mysterious way, will revive drooping chances in their ill-chosen careers. A very large and protuberant contingent comprises those whose greatest delight in life is to speechify before large and sympathetic audiences. While some are wedded to the cause, in despair of ever being wedded to anything else.

But, taking the whole motley crowd together, they are of little real value to themselves, to their sex or to their country when compared with those other women who are steadfastly and devotedly, in their varying circumstances and environments, living true to their sex, true to its noble purpose, the betterment of the race; even though the happiness of motherhood has been denied to many of them.

CHAP. X

Aside from their assaults upon marriage, home and motherlove, as obstacles that bar the way to the accomplishment of their purposes, what are some of the many reasons the suffragettes of both sexes give for depriving the great body of women of the right not to vote?

Many of them are unanswerable. That in mid-winter a number of women should wade several hundred miles through mud and slush; that thousands of dollars worth of ornaments, that priceless heir-looms and invaluable relics should be thrown into a cauldron to be fused and cast in an imitation Liberty Bell; that disorderly crowds of them should interfere with the orderly working of legislation; these and other like performances may be arguments. If they are, I know of no answer to them.

A procession is not an argument. Nor in these days of millions of people gathered in one city, does it really prove much, if anything, except on rare occasions. When, as a spontaneous outburst, one hundred and forty or fifty thousand men march in voluntary procession up through the main thoroughfares of New York City it is very significant. But when after months of more or less praiseworthy recruiting, all over New York and other adjacent States, they can only get

together some twenty or thirty thousand women at the most in a procession to exploit the Cause, one is immediately struck with wonder that considering the vast body of women drawn from the number of marchers is so few.

As for the public interest awakened, as manifested by the crowds of spectators, it is well to remember that any big circus parade will attract as great or greater crowds, particularly if they have on exhibition a few ponderous elephants, pachyderms, giraffes, or camels, and lovely women on horseback, dressed like men, cavorting about.

The "antis" do none of these things, and yet their representatives duly carry out their wishes at the polls, if not in the Legislature, and for the safety of the state will continue to do so, it is to be hoped.

CHAP. XI

Let us now consider some of the more important of their more articulate reasons, that are not quite so evidently mere ebullitions, of plain Feminism.

They urge as one that women pay taxes, but do not vote, and that there should be "No taxation without representation." When they undertake to couple that expression with their demand to vote, they ascribe to it a meaning that it never had when it was used as a sort of slogan at the beginning of the War of the Revolution. The colonists' grievance was that they were as a community to get nothing, no benefit from the taxes that were exacted from them. That they were being exploited for the benefit of some Englishman at home in England without any regard for their own interests or their own rights and that their wishes in the matter had never been consulted or considered; that this treatment was like that of a conquered province; against such conditions they rebelled very naturally. All that they demanded was that their interests should be considered and protected and their rights recognized. The form and manner of that protection and recognition, they did not prescribe; they did not demand the ballot. That was all there was to that. Now it may be pertinent to observe just here that there never lived a more forceful, intel-

ligent or capable lot of women than those revolutionary women who had aided their men most efficiently in wresting from savage men and savage nature the homes and property they enjoyed. From all accounts there was little that got by them.

Had women, such as the mother of Washington, and she was typical of her sex in those heroic days, felt that their rights and interests were not safely and properly represented by their men, they would have demanded the vote and got it, then and there. They had a power that only those who preside over homes can ever attain to.

I would suggest to suffragette orators and writers that they consult more carefully the records, speeches, and documents of the Revolutionary period before making a further use of this slogan as an argument.

Again with an air of profound conviction they assert that: "Government should be by the consent of the governed."

In this country the government is the rule of the majority. Now the suffragettes ask that the vote be conferred upon women as a body—they talk about the millions of enthralled women in this country. They seem to make it a point not to ask for it individually but as women, representing women in their totality. Now the ma-

jority of women in this country are opposed to it. They do not consider themselves enthralled, theirs is too much of self-respect. There is not a State in this Union, except Utah, in which the women leaders are willing to leave the settlement of the question to the arbitrament of their own sex.

Taking then women as an entirety, we find the disagreeable condition of a small but noisy and unscrupulous minority trying to bully-rag and cajole men into forcing upon the more numerous and influential body of their saner sisters something they do not want; and it speaks badly for the intelligence and manliness of the men of the country that so many have been found to favor their unjust and oppressive scheme against the majority of womankind.

When a majority manifest their opposition to a scheme to change existing conditions, it is equivalent to a consent to the continuance of them.

I have had suffragettes say to me with touching earnestness: "Are we not both human beings? Why should you have a vote and not I?" With equal logic I might answer: "True, we are both human beings; then why should you wear your hair long when I have to have mine cut; or why should your limbs have the freedom of skirts while I have to confine mine in inartistic trousers?"

With what touching declamation have I heard

womenly orators proclaim that without the vote the women of our State were reduced to the level of infants, lunatics, paupers, aliens, criminals, and condemned murderers. Bosh!

Though, from motives of public policy for all citizens and out of special consideration for them, women are relieved from voting and many other duties incumbent upon male citizens, they are, nevertheless, citizens of the State endowed with all the privileges of men, and more besides. She can sue for breach of promise of marriage and get something—can he? It would take too much space to enumerate all the advantages over men that women have under our statutes. There are so many of them that I have never heard a suffragette make room for any in her public speeches.

The claim is also made that without the vote women are deprived of political influence. The Statutes of the State of New York give abundant proof of the benign influence of brainy, conscientious, womanly women upon our written laws. I admit that you will never hear either in public or in private any advocate of the cause tell the truth about the laws of New York State in regard to women. Yet, these laws stand there witnessing to the full appreciation by the Legislators that they represented their women constituents just as much as any others, and witnessing as well as to

the effective political influence of women and to the pitiful mendacity of so many apostles of the "Cause."

Furthermore the vote is not needed to give ample opportunities to women in the various occupations to which they may see fit to devote themselves. There are many who have won success and distinction in letters, in art, in finance, and all the other higher callings.

Very few of them, however, are in the ranks of the suffragettes. Most of them are pronounced in their opposition to it. In fact there are few women of distinction who favor it except such as have gained their prominence by reason of their advocacy of it. Nevertheless it is a favorite argument that votes for women will give each and every woman a better chance to live her own life, to have her individual career. That it will create somehow an equality of opportunity between the sexes. That can never be. To enter upon a life career a man has not to fight against his own higher nature; he has to stifle no imperative call of his very existence; he need to do no violence to the laws of either his physical or moral being. He enters upon it untrammeled. Can she? If not, she has a terrible handicap that no right to vote can ever free her from or even mitigate.

Let us not forget that there is one career—or it may better be turned "calling"—upon which

a woman may enter with no such handicaps; but like any career, her success in it is dependent upon her natural fitness, her careful training and preparation, and her prosecution of it with her whole heart.

Though terms of money are incapable of expressing them, her possible rewards are greater than any other human being can ever receive. No other success can bring the same blessed satisfaction nor confer so great a blessing on the race. And in other "careers".

After all, what is it to add a few acres more or less of paint-covered canvas to the thousands of other acres already in existence, unless by it some great message is conveyed! And to how few, how very, very few, ever comes the real message, the real inspiration? To practically all, how disappointing the final result.

And of the writers, the flood of useless books show how few have the moral courage to refrain unless they, too, have a real vital message. The urging of a mere "furor scribendi" often sounds too much like a real inspiration. Whatever her occupation, particularly when not taken up through necessity, but through the desire to escape natural destiny, how bizarre her achievements in it when compared with the results, upon itself and upon the lives it comes in contact with, of the

blessed influence of the life of a gentle womanly woman.

There are those few who, driven by the cruel spur of real genius, attempt the unusual; by such, happiness is usually knowingly forfeited, whatever the sex.

But they say: "The old order is changing. More and more women are being driven or seduced from their homes by modern economic conditions." It is true that improved methods and implements do relieve the modern mother, wife and home-maker from many of the duties and drudgeries to which she was formerly subjected, but it is an insult to woman's intelligence to claim that there are not sufficient ways in which she can exert her energies thus liberated without foregoing her womanliness. It is true that necessity has forced many women to do men's work.

That so many are to-day engaged in business pursuits is one of the unhealthy symptoms of the times. Unhealthy because it is not in accordance with the natural order of things and has a deteriorating effect upon both women and men. History has abundantly shown that when any civilization goes contrary to the basic principles of human nature sooner or later a readjustment is bound to come that costs human beings very dearly.

I have heard it confidently asserted that, "Women are natural housekeepers: Government is a matter of house-keeping, therefore women are perfectly competent to run the government." This claim shows a fundamental ignorance of what Government really is. True some of its subsidiary developments are in a way analagous to house-keeping, but its essential function is the maintenance of Law and Order. Upon that, the development of all social processes depends. That is not a matter to be fooled with by pretentious women.

There is also the assertion that the individual and not the family is now the social and economic unit. That the wife as well as the husband is an individual and as such should vote. Now let me again remind the readers that Society, speaking broadly, is chiefly concerned with those upon whom the future of the race depends. The rest of us are mere isolated entities not in the stream of life.

Marriage has been termed in law a matrimonial partnership. Any partnership of two is a union of two individuals in which, for the purpose of the partnership, the two individuals are merged into one. Each partner has different functions; where each wants to do the same things as the other, perform the same functions, there is trouble from the start.

Usually one attends to the inside or office work, the other is known as the "outside man." It is the latter who usually represents the firm, which is regarded as an entity. There is, or should be, no jealousy between them, for each is equally essential to the success of their mutual enterprise. This does not mean, however, that each may not take a helpful interest in the work of the other.

Now in the case of the marital partnership, there is a feature that does not exist in any other. The State in effect guarantees to the wife the due performance of his part of the contract by the husband, and only in a very slight degree guarantees that she will also make good. The State is vitally interested in the probable result of the partnership, the children; and it is for their sake that it is made so binding. The family is thus more than the association of two individuals in a partnership; it is an economic and political unit and is so recognized by the State, even if not by the suffragists, and the husband is the outside partner.

Now the fact that the husband does the outside work, and the wife the inside work, has led the suffragette orators and writers into two errors. As he receives money for his wares, whether they be his labor or merchandise, and she does not, they are pleased to say that the two are not on

terms of economic equality, and furthermore, as the wife contributes no money to the firm, that she is a social parasite, living on her husband. They forget, do Mrs. Gilman and the others, that in a partnership everything is owned in common and that the State, when necessary, recognizes the right of the wife in her husband's earnings.

There are, however, parasitic wives. One such case I will instance. The husband was at the time of the marriage a hardworking capable young lawyer making a very fair income in partnership with another lawyer, not, however, enough to meet the many extravangancies of his wife.

She had some faculty for writing and thought in that way to add to the family exchequer, to justify her expenditures. Most unfortunately she took a first prize with one of her stories, and thereupon became no longer much of a mother and housewife, but rather a talented author. She had long been an ardent suffragette. There were two children and he was an affectionate father, and when her absorption in her literary pursuits was so intense that she had little time for the children he tried to make up for this, to them, with the result that he lost more and more time at the office.

So matters went on, he attending to household affairs more and more, that it was really her part of the contract to attend to, while she reveled in

the individuality and separateness of her literary career. Presently his business partner, unwilling to do extra work any longer, and not in the least sympathetic with the wife's idea of economic independence, broke off the partnership. By this the unfortunate husband's income dropped by an amount several times greater than her earnings from her career. Did she repent her of her course? Not much. She told her friends that her husband was lazy and incompetent and that were it not for her earnings the family would starve. The end is not quite yet. She was what can properly be termed a parasitic wife.

There is another who neglects her home and family and spends his money largely on railroad fares and hotel bills on suffragette business. I have heard her talk eloquently about poor, abused, spiritless, parasitic women.

After a certain development of the fever, a suffragette becomes almost a hopeless case. It may be that after it has had its run the fever may abate, but it may take a long time.

CHAP. XII

When the great war is over there are going to be some very interesting developments among the women of the combatting nations who have taken the places in the various industries of the fighting men. The suffragettes claim as a prime reason for giving women the vote here that in those countries the women who have taken up the work of the absent men have become so accustomed to it that they will insist on retaining the places after the men have returned and further that they will insist upon having the ballot and will get it. That then this country will be found lagging in the march of progress unless we give women the votes in the meantime. I think that their premises are mistaken.

Those patriotic women have taken up the absent men's work as a duty, and not from any dissatisfaction with their own normal functions. Those fortunate ones to whom their men return will be only too glad to resume their normal places in the homes and families and leave to the men their proper duties of providing and husbanding. As for the others, it may be their sad lot to continue their enforced drudgery. Conditions in this country are happily different and let us hope they may remain so. The reward for patriotic service should not be slavery.

But there is one of their many other arguments, so-called, that deserves attention. They state that men have made such a muddle of our governmental matters, national and State, that we should give the women a chance to see what they can do. In the thirty-eight years since I became a voter there have been great improvements effected in New York State and in the United States, as every intelligent man knows. What has been accomplished from the beginning of our National Government is wonderful. It began on a new and untried principle, some modifications of its original plan have been found to be necessary as was to be expected. It is wonderful that there were not more.

Under its broad provisions the country has grown from a comparatively narrow strip along the Atlantic coast inhabited by a population small, and not entirely homogenous. It has stood the violent test of a presidential contest every four years. It has waged within its own borders, between its own citizens of different sections, a four years' bloody war, greater in point of numbers involved than any of recent history until the awful conflict that is now raging. After that terrific struggle of brother against brother, the sundered parts came together and the rapidity and thoroughness with which the awful wound has healed shows the soundness of its constitution

and the vigorous health of its entire body. We have received to our citizenship millions after millions of foreign people, whose training, habits, and manner of thought were widely foreign to ours; our rapid assimilation of them, while not yet entirely complete, is to the candid mind amazing.

Materially we have prospered wonderfully. Educationally, our advance, considering the mass of illiterate strangers we have received has been marvelous. In all this improvement of conditions, women as women have benefited equally with men as men. So that for the past we have little to apologize for. It is not safe to give the vote to any who cannot see all this.

Safe, though, we have come thus far, it may be that in the near future we may be subjected to more acute and severe tests, both foreign and domestic, than we have ever before faced. In such an event it is inconceivable that women's votes would aid us. They would only hamper, annoy, and clog, and render almost hopeless the solution of many of our greatest political problems.

We have enough ignorant or worse voters already in our overcharged electorate without increasing the volume of them.

CHAP. XIII

So far this discussion has been concerned chiefly with a broad if terse consideration of some of the principal reasons for their demand as given by the suffragists themselves, and with that, the fundamental Laws of Nature, which they seemingly ignore, and the ideals cherished by most of us that they would shatter and destroy. Most of the women who are enlisted in the "Cause" have at the best but an incoherent, hysterical conception of what benefit they or their sex will gain should the franchise be extended to include them. How often have I heard, in effect: "Well, at all events it is bound to come. And when we get the vote there will be sure to come some good out of it," and invariably claiming that as a matter of simple justice women should be enfranchised.

One of their ablest writers, Mr. Nathaniel C. Fowler, in his recent book, "The Principle of Suffrage," employs the same typical argument. He writes:

"If I knew that universal suffrage would set my country back a hundred years, if I were assured that universal suffrage would turn political mud into political slime, if I were certain that universal suffrage would multiply grog shops and lower millions to the level of the gutter, if I had evidence that universal suffrage would upset this country

of ours, cause the public schools to deteriorate and other great institutions to lower their standard, I should cast my ballot in favor of votes for women, feeling it a duty to God and to man." One would think from reading this that Mr. Fowler had gained his knowledge of political science from study of the subject at a certain Woman's College, whose graduates seem to be imbued with this same theory, that also seems to be generally held among the suffragettes, namely, that the object of Government is to furnish a field for individual exploitation. It is not.

Government exists to give to the community or communities within its jurisdiction, such a management of its public affairs as to render the collective State over which it is established, secure both from attacks from without and from domestic troubles within its borders, and also to give to each citizen belonging to it so much of individual liberty and privilege as is consistent with the liberties and privileges of every other citizen, individually and collectively. In this light and for the furtherance of these ends, the extension or limitation of the franchise is clearly not a matter of individual right, but of Public Policy. If then, the use of the ballot by women would result in any of the evils Mr. Fowler enumerates, it would be plainly contrary to Public Policy to extend the franchise to include them.

As a matter of fact, among the western states that have adopted "Votes for Women" just exactly such results as he alludes to, are found.

Utah, the central one of the cluster is a Mormon state. It is unnecessary to say more than that except to call attention to the fact that in the adjacent states, the Mormon influence is very strong, and that influence is all for suffrage, so it is very natural that such states should be for suffrage. Mormons have a very effective way of managing their women.

Colorado in which woman suffrage has been established so many years that it is no longer an experiment, is probably the state that Mr. Fowler had in mind when he wrote. The general impotency of its State government has been pretty well shown during the last few years; while the local government of the City of Denver, by the direct influence of women's votes has had a somewhat variegated record.

The legislation in the state of California since its women have voted, has been chaotic, to say the least, and its state and local governments have deteriorated. In Seattle, in still another suffrage state, a condition prevails, under suffrage that almost demands the formation of a vigilance committee, in which of course women would have no part. Such conditions, if continued lead to

public disorder and social disintegration, which the women will look to the men to correct.

In most of those states bordering on Utah, the Mormons hold the balance of power, intrenched in it by the votes of their women. Their church is rich in money and resources, secret in its organization, with a great membership thoroughly knit together, and if reports be true, growing fast, aided by the political strength given it by womens votes. These facts I leave to the consideration of those who consider the further extension of the franchise a trivial matter, only adding that polygamy, while not openly practiced where the laws are against it, is the law of the church in its Mexican possessions. Nor so far as known have its secret oaths, obligations, and purposes been altered one whit.

But aside from that issue, if these conditions hold in the Western States and cities under woman suffrage, what is to prevent similar results if that suffrage is extended over the entire country?

I am no alarmist; I simply believe in waking up and looking facts squarely in the face.

CHAP. XIV

When a nation is asked to change from a sound, tested position to an untried and probably perilous one, there should be adduced absolutely convincing arguments in its favor before such a change can be sanely made. In the present issue, no such arguments have been brought forward. There are none.

Government is, broadly speaking, concerned with two things, regulation and protection. If it is to be effective in either or both of these directions, experience has shown that it must have virility, not the bogus virility of the emasculated man or of the masculine woman, but that of the real vigorous man.

Will the general participation in our government of women, on the proposed basis, enhance or diminish that essential quality? To any reasonable mind there can be but one answer, "No."

The question then becomes the simple but momentous one, "Shall our Country meet the perils that are even now threatening, with an emasculated Government, or not?"

My fellow countrymen and countrywomen, all citizens, the answer rests with you.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 029 809 772 2